REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 11, 14, 23, 24, 27, 33, and 34 have been amended.

Claims 4, 15, and 25 have been cancelled.

Formal Matters

Appreciation is expressed for the telephonic interview conducted by Examiner Won with Shawn Doman on January 8, 2009. During the interview, the Examiner suggested that more clearly describing the claimed "operations" of claim 1 in order to overcome the cited reference Wong. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made herein are in accord with the substance of the interview.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-16, 18-36, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,070,177 issued to Kao et al. ("Kao") in view of U.S. Patent 7,127,448 issued to Wong et al. ("Wong"). To the extent that they might be applied against the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented below with respect to independent claim 1 are generally applicable to the rejections of independent claims 14 and 24, as the Office Action uses substantially similar rejections to the limitations of independent claims 14 and 24 generally require the same disputed limitations of claim 1. Exemplary claim 1 recites:

> An apparatus comprising:
> an application program comprising
> > one or more business components, wherein a business component
> > > comprises one or more fields, wherein
> > > > the fields correspond to records in a database, and the database is
> > > > separate from the application program,

> means for selecting for auditing a business component from the one or more business components,
>
> means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations of a plurality of operations, wherein
>
> > the selected operations include one or more of: update, add, copy, and delete,
> >
> > the operations are configured to operate on the selected business component, and
> >
> > the means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations is further configured to exclude one or more operations of the plurality of operations from auditing,
>
> means for creating an audit trail for the application program, and
>
> means for providing the audit trail to the database associated with the fields of the business component.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Kao and Wong do not disclose each element of independent claim 1. Specifically, the proposed combination of Kao and Wong fails to disclose "means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations of a plurality of operations, wherein the selected operations include one or more of: update, add, copy, and delete."

Instead, Kao is directed to purportedly associating an audit history with a database form. *See* Kao, Abstract. Kao's audit trail purportedly lists the transmission history of the database form, including such information at the user name of users who receive the form and the actions taken by the users. *See* Kao 5:38-44. Wong is purportedly directed to selectively auditing accesses to a relational database. *See* Wong, Abstract. In Wong, an audit record is created only for rows in the database that are actually accessed, and not for those that are not (e.g. if the row does not meet a condition, the row will not be accessed, and will not be audited, even though the row was a target of a query.) *See* Wong 8:20-30.

But neither the cited portions of Kao, nor those of Wong, taken alone or in combination, disclose a means for selecting an operation (such as update, add, copy, delete) for auditing. The Office Action cites the following passage of Kao as purportedly disclosing that the selected operations include update, add, copy, and delete: "users may have the ability to modify the data within the form, or they may be allowed only to view the form and not make any changes." Kao 5:11-13 (cited at Office Action, p. 9). Applicants respectfully submit that the modification of data as disclosed by the cited passage is unrelated selecting certain operations to be audited. Instead, the cited passage

is related to data entry into a database form. Kao's disclosure of the ability to enter data into a database form does not encompass selecting certain operations for auditing.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Applicants have amended claim 3 to clarify that an audit transaction record regarding the business component is generated in response to detecting the selected operations. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Kao and Wong fail to disclose this feature. The Office Action cites the following portions of Kao as purportedly disclosing the limitations of claim 3:

> As the document or database form 302 is transmitted from one user to another user in a network, the information relating to each user is appended to the audit trail. Thus, the audit trail maintains a running list of the users that have received the document or form.

Kao 5:51-56 (cited at Office Action, p. 8). Applicants respectfully submit that the above portion of Kao fails to disclose generating an audit trail record. Instead, the cited portion discloses modifying an existing audit trail.

Furthermore, Kao's modification (appending) is not done in response to detecting a selected operation, wherein the operation is are configured to operate on the business component. Instead, Kao's modification is purportedly done when a user receives the document. Applicants respectfully submit that receiving the document is not comparable to detecting one of the claimed selected operations.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Kao and Wong fail to disclose, at least, means for restricting access to an audit trail. The Office Action cites the following portions (among others) of Kao as purportedly disclosing this limitation:

> The database form can be transmitted from one user of a network to another user of the network, and the layout and data contents of the form will not change, unless a particular user is authorized to make a change prior to transmission to another user.

Kao 5:29-33 (cited at Office Action, p. 9). Applicants respectfully submit that the above portion of Kao fails to disclose restricting access to an audit trail. Instead, the cited passage discloses that users must be authorized to access the contents of the form, which is not the same thing as the audit trail. The form "is simply a template that provides data

- 12 -

entry fields...." Kao 5:2-3. While the form and audit trail may be displayed simultaneously, the two are not to be confounded. *See* Kao, 5:13-15.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Kao and Wong fail to disclose, at least, a means for querying one or more of the audit transaction records. The Office Action cites the following portions (among others) of Kao as purportedly disclosing this limitation:

> Audit trail display area 304 lists such information as the name or ID of the user who created the form, the names or ID's of each of the users who received the form, the data and time of reception, any action taken by each user, and other such information. In this manner, the audit trail display area 304 provides a means by which the transmission history and actions taken regarding a particular document, set of data, or database form may be viewed by the users of the document or form.

Kao 5:40-48 (cited at Office Action, p. 10). Applicants respectfully submit that the above portion of Kao fails to disclose means to query an audit transaction record. Instead, the cited passage discloses a means (display) for viewing an audit trail. Simply disclosing the ability to view an audit trail does not disclose a means for querying an audit transaction record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 14, and 24, as well as claims 2, 3, 5-13, 16, 18-23, 26-36, 38, and 39 (which depend therefrom) and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099